



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/785,000	02/16/2001	Alison Lee	YOR920000110US2	4058

7590 07/30/2003

LUIS J. PERCELLO  
IBM CORPORATION  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW DEPT.  
P.O. BOX 218  
YORKTOWN HEIGHTS, NY 10598

EXAMINER

PHAM, HUNG Q

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2172

DATE MAILED: 07/30/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/785,000

Applicant(s)

LEE ET AL.

Examiner

HUNG Q PHAM

Art Unit

2172

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 May 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 25-27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 1, 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In particular, the amended limitation of *collecting social information at a Web site* in claim 1, and *collecting data representing a social category at a Web site* in claims 25-27 are not described in the specification.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

Art Unit: 2172

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

**5. Claims 1-6 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawasaki [USP 6,539,375 B2] in view of Hazlehurst et al. [USP 6,289,353 B1].**

Regarding to claim 1, Kawasaki teaches a method for profiling a User of the Internet according to predefined categories of interest (Kawasaki, Col. 2, line 60-Col. 3, lines 9). As shown in Kawasaki FIG. 2, the data sets 21 represents sets of major areas of interest include, but are not limited to, sports, games, business, investing, health, hobbies, technology, arts, politics, social issues, weather and news (Kawasaki, Col. 4,

Art Unit: 2172

lines 26-32). The two modules, scanning and analyzing, are used in real time to assess the incoming data from Services to the Users of the Services for their relevance to the common or specific predefined categories of interest to Advertisers. This is accomplished through collecting representative data sets of major areas of interest, data sets 21, and using a developed set of algorithms and weighted rules to analyze the unknown content for a match with Data Sets 21 (Kawasaki, Col. 4, lines 6-25).

Recognizers are executed against incoming unknown data requested by Users. As shown in FIG. 1, the statistical output from Recognizers 23 indicate whether a given set of unknown data received or sent through the Internet 18 has a good match to the installed Recognizers 23. For example, if a golfing Recognizer 23 is loaded and the User views golf-related Web Pages 13a, E-mail 12a, User Groups 16a or other digital content, the golfing Recognizer 23 returns a positive match for that Data Set 21 (Kawasaki, Col. 4, lines 33-41). Thus, whenever a user visits a website, the unknown incoming data requested by Users will go through the Recognizer as *collecting social information at a web site*, and the data set 21 is analyzed to perform a match for the unknown data as *mapping said social information into a data structure representing two or more categories*. Kawasaki fails to teach *each of the categories divided into subcategories of ordered levels of specificity, each of the ordered levels of specificity being a grouping of subcategories of the same levels of specificity*. As shown in Hazlehurst FIG. 2, documents in vector space 35 are tightly clustered around the emergent sub concepts of *AZT*, *HIV*, and *AIDS* research, while documents in vector space 37 are focused on *bone cancer* and *breast cancer* and documents in vector space 39 are further focused on

Art Unit: 2172

*fibrocystic breast condition, prostate cancer diagnosis, and breast cancer treatment* (Col. 5, line 40-Col. 6, line 17). Thus, the vector space 36 as a data structure representing two concepts *AIDS* and *CANCER* as two categories, vector 37 as a subcategory of 36 focuses on *BONE CANCER* and *BREAST CANCER*, and 39 as a subcategory of 37 focuses on the condition of *fibrocystic breast cancer, diagnosis of prostate cancer* and *treatment of breast cancer*. At each level of category and subcategory, a group of subcategories is associated with the category or subcategory at that level. The subcategory is more specific as going down from one subcategory to another subcategory, and this indicates the claimed *each of the categories divided into subcategories of ordered levels of specificity, each of the ordered levels of specificity being a grouping of subcategories of the same levels of specificity*. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Kawasaki method by including the technique of diving the category into subcategory of ordered levels of specificity as taught by Hazlehurst in order to classify the data sets of major areas of interest in specific details representing by subcategories.

Regarding to claim 2, Kawasaki and Hazlehurst teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, Hazlehurst further discloses *the data structure includes one or more sections, the sections being logical intersections of one of the categories with one of the levels of specificity* (Hazlehurst, Col. 4, line 50-Col. 7, line 10). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Kawasaki method by including the sections in the category as taught by

Hazlehurst in order to represent the data sets of major areas of interest in specific details representing by subcategories.

Regarding to claim 3, Kawasaki and Hazlehurst teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 2, Hazlehurst further discloses *one or more subcategories have a degree of closeness relating the section to one or more other sections* (Hazlehurst, FIG. 10A-B, Cols. 12-13). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Kawasaki method by including the degree of closeness as taught by Hazlehurst in order to represent the data sets of major areas of interest in specific details representing by subcategories.

Regarding to claim 4, Kawasaki and Hazlehurst teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 3, Hazlehurst further discloses *the degree of closeness relates to any one or more of following: a physical closeness of location of physical items represented by the respective sections, a relational closeness between one or more users and one or more objects, a relational closeness between one or more users, a semantic closeness of descriptions of items represented by the respective sections, and a behavioral closeness of pattern of use* (Hazlehurst, FIG. 10A-B, Cols. 12-13). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Kawasaki method by including the relation of the degree of closeness as taught by Hazlehurst in order to represent the data sets of major areas of interest in specific details representing by subcategories.

Regarding to claim 5, Kawasaki and Hazlehurst teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, Kawasaki further discloses *the categories include any one or more of the following: a product category, a service category, a category class, a category list, a product class, a list of products in a class, a product specification, a service class, a list of services, and a service specification* (Kawasaki, FIG. 2).

Regarding to claim 6, Kawasaki and Hazlehurst teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, Hazlehurst further discloses: *the levels of specificity include any one or more of the following: category class, category list, offering specification, product class, list of products in a class, product specification, service class, list of services, and a service specification* (Hazlehurst, Col. 5, line 40-Col. 6, line 17). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Kawasaki method by including the levels of specificity as taught by Hazlehurst in order to represent the data sets of major areas of interest in specific details representing by subcategories.

Regarding to claim 24, Kawasaki and Hazlehurst teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, Hazlehurst further discloses *the social information mapped in the data structure is served over one or more of the network connections for display of one or more visual districts on one or more clients* (Hazlehurst, Col. 28, lines 48-50). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the



Art Unit: 2172

invention was made to modify the Kawasaki method by including the technique of displaying one or more visual district as taught by Hazlehurst in order to represent the data sets of major areas of interest in specific details representing by subcategories.

**6. Claims 7-9 and 16-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawasaki [USP 6,539,375 B2] in view of Hazlehurst et al. [USP 6,289,353 B1] and Nortel et al. [WebQuery: Searching and Visualizing the Web through Connectivity].**

Regarding to claim 7, Kawasaki and Hazlehurst teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, but does not disclose the step of *collecting information about one or more nodes located on one or more of the districts*. Nortel teaches a method for searching and visualizing the Web, Nortel further discloses the step of *collecting information about one or more nodes located on one or more of the districts* (Nortel, pages 5-7). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Kawasaki and Hazlehurst method by including the step of collecting information about one or more nodes as taught by Nortel in order to represent the data sets of major areas of interest in specific details representing by subcategories.

Regarding to claim 8, Kawasaki, Hazlehurst and Nortel teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 7, Nortel further discloses *the nodes are*

Art Unit: 2172

*differentiated by any one or more node functions* (Nortel, pages 5-6). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Kawasaki, Hazlehurst and Nortel method by including the technique of differentiating the nodes in order to represent the data sets of major areas of interest in specific details representing by subcategories.

Regarding to claim 9, Kawasaki, Hazlehurst and Nortel teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 8, Hazlehurst further discloses *the node functions include any one or more of the following: initiating a chat session, providing information, causing a user to be associated with a node location, providing access to sales information, providing access to a salesman, and changing a browser page to one that has information relating to the node* (Hazlehurst, Col. 2, lines 39-49).

Regarding to claim 16, Kawasaki, Hazlehurst and Nortel teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 7, Hazlehurst further discloses *the system comprising one or more paths, each path connecting two or more nodes* (Hazlehurst, Col. 9, lines 50-60).

Regarding to claim 17, Kawasaki, Hazlehurst and Nortel teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 16, Hazlehurst further discloses *the path links two or more of the nodes to associate connectivity relationships among the nodes* (Hazlehurst, Col. 9, lines 50-60).

Regarding to claim 18, Kawasaki, Hazlehurst and Nortel teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 16, Hazlehurst further discloses *a path is associated with one of the following: a user's path through one or more of the districts, a customer's path through one or more of the districts, a preferred path of a group of users through one or more of the districts, a preferred path of a group of users with common interests through one or more of the districts, and a preferred path of a group of users with complementary interests through one or more of the districts* (Hazlehurst, Col. 9, lines 50-60).

Regarding to claim 19, Kawasaki, Hazlehurst and Nortel teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 7, Nortel further discloses *one or more node sets, each node set containing one or more nodes clustered in nearby locations in one or more of the districts* (Nortel, pages 3-5). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Kawasaki, Hazlehurst and Nortel method by including the feature of node sets in order to represent the data sets of major areas of interest in specific details representing by subcategories and retrieve a document from the Internet.

Regarding to claim 20, Kawasaki, Hazlehurst and Nortel teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 19, Nortel further discloses *a node set represent a relationship among two or more nodes located in one or more of the districts* (Nortel, pages

Art Unit: 2172

3-5). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Kawasaki, Hazlehurst and Nortel method by including the feature of node sets in order to represent the data sets of major areas of interest in specific details representing by subcategories and retrieve a document from the Internet.

Regarding to claim 21, Kawasaki, Hazlehurst and Nortel teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 19, Nortel further discloses *where one or more of the node sets is associated with one of the following: a density of users gathered in one or more adjacent node locations, a set of node locations marking results of a search, a set of node locations related by a semantic attribute, a set of node locations visited by a group of users with common interests, a set of node locations visited by a group of users with complementary interests, and a crowd of users* (Nortel, pages 3-5). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Kawasaki, Hazlehurst and Nortel method by including the feature of node sets in order to represent the data sets of major areas of interest in specific details representing by subcategories and retrieve a document from the Internet.

Regarding to claim 22, Kawasaki, Hazlehurst and Nortel teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 19, Nortel further discloses *one or more of the node sets has a node set function* (Nortel, pages 3-5). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the

Kawasaki, Hazlehurst and Nortel method by including the feature of node sets in order to represent the data sets of major areas of interest in specific details representing by subcategories and retrieve a document from the Internet.

Regarding to claim 23, Kawasaki, Hazlehurst and Nortel teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 22, Hazlehurst further discloses *the node set function includes any one or more of the following: providing information about the set, changing a user's location to be associated with a node location in the set, and changing browser page to one that has information relating to a node in the set* (Nortel, pages 3-5).

**7. Claims 10-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawasaki [USP 6,539,375 B2] in view of Hazlehurst et al. [USP 6,029,172], Nortel et al. [WebQuery: Searching and Visualizing the Web through Connectivity] and American Online, Inc. [AOL.COM].**

Regarding to claim 10, Kawasaki, Hazlehurst and Nortel teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 7, but fails to disclose: *one or more of the nodes is a landmark that marks a salient location on one or more of the districts*. AOL is a well-known Internet Service Provider and considered as *a landmark that marks a salient location on one or more of the districts*. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Kawasaki, Hazlehurst and

Art Unit: 2172

Nortel method by including one or more nodes is a landmark in order to differentiate the nodes in the networking system.

Regarding to claim 11, Kawasaki, Hazlehurst, Nortel and American Online, Inc. teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 10, American Online, Inc. further discloses the Autos as one of categories and considered as *the salient location is fixed and associated with one of a plurality of business categories*. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Kawasaki, Hazlehurst, Nortel and American Online method by associating business categories with the salient location in order to differentiate the nodes in the networking system.

Regarding to claim 12, Kawasaki, Hazlehurst, Nortel and American Online, Inc. teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 10, American Online, Inc. further discloses free chat as *the salient location can change in time and is associated with an activity*. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Kawasaki, Hazlehurst, Nortel and American Online method by changing in time of salient location in order to differentiate the nodes in the networking system.

Regarding to claim 13, Kawasaki, Hazlehurst, Nortel and American Online, Inc. teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 12, American Online, Inc.

Art Unit: 2172

further discloses: *the activity is one or more of the following: a current "hot spot", "a list of most popular pages in a computer section", a public chat, a sale, a special product offering, a special service offering, and a sales agent availability.* Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Kawasaki, Hazlehurst, Nortel and American Online method by including the features of activities in order to differentiate the nodes in the networking system.

Regarding to claim 14, Kawasaki, Hazlehurst, Nortel and American Online, Inc. teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 10, American Online, Inc. further discloses: *the salient location is personally meaningful to the user.* Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Kawasaki, Hazlehurst, Nortel and American Online method by including the features of salient location in order to differentiate the nodes in the networking system.

Regarding to claim 15, Kawasaki, Hazlehurst, Nortel and American Online, Inc. teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 14, American Online, Inc. further discloses *the salient location represents any one or more of the following: a user's buddy, a chat buddy, a private chat, a user's favorite spot, and a user with common interest.* Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Kawasaki, Hazlehurst, Nortel and American Online

Art Unit: 2172

method by including the features of salient location in order to differentiate the nodes in the networking system.

**8. Claims 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawasaki [USP 6,539,375 B2] in view of Jorna et al. [USP 6,029,172].**

Regarding to claims 25-27, Kawasaki teaches a method for profiling a User of the Internet according to predefined categories of interest (Kawasaki, Col. 2, line 60-Col. 3, lines 9). As shown in Kawasaki FIG. 2, the data sets 21 represents sets of major areas of interest include, but are not limited to, sports, games, business, investing, health, hobbies, technology, arts, politics, social issues, weather and news (Kawasaki, Col. 4, lines 26-32). The two modules, scanning and analyzing, are used in real time to assess the incoming data from Services to the Users of the Services for their relevance to the common or specific predefined categories of interest to Advertisers. This is accomplished through collecting representative data sets of major areas of interest, data sets 21, and using a developed set of algorithms and weighted rules to analyze the unknown content for a match with Data Sets 21 (Kawasaki, Col. 4, lines 6-25). Recognizers are executed against incoming unknown data requested by Users. As shown in FIG. 1, the statistical output from Recognizers 23 indicate whether a given set of unknown data received or sent through the Internet 18 has a good match to the installed Recognizers 23. For example, if a golfing Recognizer 23 is loaded and the



Art Unit: 2172

User views golf-related Web Pages 13a, E-mail 12a, User Groups 16a or other digital content, the golfing Recognizer 23 returns a positive match for that Data Set 21 (Kawasaki, Col. 4, lines 33-41). Thus, whenever a user visits a website, the unknown incoming data requested by Users will go through the Recognizer as *collecting data representing a social category at a web site*, and the data set 21 is the *mapping data representing two or more categories*. Kawasaki fails to teach the step of *dividing each of the categories into subcategories of ordered levels of specificity, dividing each of the ordered levels of specificity into a grouping of subcategories of the same levels of specificity; and displaying the subcategories and the grouping of subcategories in a visual, geometric pattern*. Jorna teaches a system for enabling a user person to select a specific information item from a set of information items in an information processing system, the set of information items being organized in a classification scheme comprising a number of categories, at least two of those comprising a number of sub-categories (Abstract, and Col. 1, lines 4-10). As shown in Jorna FIG. 1 is a hierarchy of categories and sub-categories. A sub-category at one level will be a category at the next level down, comprising various sub-categories. A layer represents a certain level in the hierarchy of the classification scheme and contains categories belonging to that level. The front layer represents the highest level and contains main categories, the second layer represents the next layer down, whereby the last layer at the back represent the individual information items as contained in the lowest sub-categories (Col. 5, lines 3-22). As seen in Jorna FIG. 1, category History is divided into multiple layers or relevance. Each layer includes a group of relevant subcategory and the lower level of a subcategory, the narrower of the

specificity associated with a subcategory. This teaches the claimed *dividing each of the categories into subcategories of ordered levels of specificity, dividing each of the ordered levels of specificity into a grouping of subcategories of the same levels of specificity*. As shown in Jorna FIG. 2 is the displayed screen after selection of a particular category. When the user enters the system, the categories of the classification scheme move from a virtual horizon to their initial positions in the respective layers of the virtual space (Col. 5, lines 22-49). This teaches the claimed *displaying the subcategories and the grouping of subcategories in a visual, geometric pattern*. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Kawasaki method by including the technique of diving the category into subcategory of ordered levels of specificity and displaying as taught by Jorna in order to classify the data sets of major areas of interest in specific details representing by subcategories.

### ***Conclusion***

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 2172

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hung Pham whose telephone number is 703-605 4242. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 7:00 Am - 3:30 Pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, VU, KIM YEN can be reached on 703-305 4393. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746 7239 for regular communications and 703-746 7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305 3900.

Examiner: Hung Pham  
July 16, 2003

  
JEAN M. CORRIELUS  
PRIMARY EXAMINER